



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/517,813

12/14/2004

Bertrand Bouvet

4976-004

8614

22429

7590

09/17/2008

LOWE HAUPTMAN HAM & BERNER, LLP
1700 DIAGONAL ROAD
SUITE 300
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER

KIM, TAE K

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2153

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/17/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/517,813	Applicant(s) BOUVET, BERTRAND	
	Examiner TAE K. KIM	Art Unit 2153	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 July 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 33-64 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 33-64 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This is in response to the Applicant's response and amendment filed on June 17, 2008. Claims 1 – 32 have been previously cancelled by the Applicant. Claims 33 – 64, where Claim 33 is in independent form, are presented for examination.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on June 17, 2008 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

1. Claim 33 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The newly amended limitation, "...the first database being stored by a domain name server, referred to as a DNS server, and the system comprising a directory server, referred to as an LDAP server, able to be

Art Unit: 2153

accessed indirectly from a the DNS server..." is not supported by the specification. As currently amended, the first database to be updated can only be located on the DNS server.

This is contrary to the specification which states that the service provider has a DNS server *or* LDAP server storing a database [Para. 0045 (emphasis added)]. More importantly, when a service provider uses an LDAP server, this configuration is to make it possible to manage the data "by indirection not in the ENUM DNS but *in the LDAP directory*" [Para. 0057 (emphasis added)]. This distinction is further echoed in specification by stating, "[o]ptionally, the resource management service provider also comprises an LDAP directory server storing a database" [Para. 0079], and by the flow diagrams in Figures 12 and 13, which further details the "interrogat[ing] the LDAP database" to return the requested information [Para. 0152]. Additionally, Applicant's remarks also state that the invention "allows a subscriber to modify ENUM records stored in a database of a DNS or LDAP server" [Pg. 10].

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on June 17, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argued:

- a) The system of Claim 33 allows a subscriber to modify ENUM records stored in a database of a DNS or LDAP server, from a terminal.
- b) Call uses LDAP or DNS server in a classical way (to give an IP address of a website), thus it is implied that Call does not update the records.

Art Unit: 2153

- c) Call indicates two LDAP server are used.
- d) Call creates a new Internet Domain Extension for matching a manufacturer code to an IP address of the manufacturer.
- e) Call does not disclose LDAP and DNS servers in combination to manage information by "indirection."

Examiner respectfully disagrees with applicant's assertions.

2. With regards to a), the system of Claim 33 only claims updating of "a record associated with at least one subscriber...stored in a first database..." There is no mentioning of updating ENUM records within the claimed limitations, thus updating any record associated with one subscriber is sufficient to meet this limitation.

Call discloses of a method and apparatus for acquiring and updating product information where a server (terminal) may send a request to a remote directory server (LDAP or DNS server) to obtain the URL at which information is available [Abstract; Col. 4, Lines 58-61; Col. 6, Lines 19-26; Col. 20, Lines 60-63]. Call meets the claimed limitation.

3. With regards to b), Call also discloses of a method and apparatus for updating product information where a server may send a request to a remote directory server (LDAP or DNS server) to obtain the URL at which information is available [Abstract; Col. 4, Lines 58-61; Col. 6, Lines 19-26; Col. 20, Lines 60-63]. Call meets the claimed limitation.

Art Unit: 2153

4. With regards to c), Call discloses that using a second LDAP server is an optional set by stating “the [server] could again use the LDAP protocol designated by the remainder of the universal product code from a second LDAP directory server” [Col. 20, Lines 63-67]. Furthermore, Applicant’s remarks do not state why using a second LDAP server distinguishes it from the current invention, but merely repeats the cited passages of Call. Call meets the claimed limitation.

5. With regards to d), the Internet Domain Extension is merely the first-level domain of a given server and does not change the role of the DNS. Furthermore, Applicant’s remarks do not state why using a second LDAP server distinguishes it from the current invention, but merely repeats the cited passages of Call. Call meets the claimed limitation.

6. With regards to e), Call discloses the use of a LDAP directory server to use distinguished names (DN) which may take the form of a company code portion of a universal product code [Col. 20, Lines 52-55]. Using the DN to access information is exactly how Call manages information by “indirection.” Call meets the claimed limitation.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 33 – 43, 51, 58 – 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,154,738, invented by Charles Gainor Call (hereinafter referenced as “Call”).

Art Unit: 2153

7. Regarding Claim 33, Call discloses a system for updating a record [Abstract; Col. 4, Lines 58-61; Col. 6, Lines 19-26; Col. 20, Lines 60-63; method and apparatus for acquiring and updating product information where a server may send a request to a remote directory server to obtain the URL at which information is available] associated with at least one subscriber of a service provider for managing telecommunication resources [Col. 21, Lines 54-60; the DNS server is typically assigned by the customer's Internet (telecommunication resources) service provider], said record being stored in a first database [Abstract; Col. 4, Lines 58-61; Col. 6, Lines 19-26; Col. 20, Lines 60-63; method and apparatus for acquiring and updating product information where a server may send a request to a remote directory server to obtain the URL at which information is available], the record including one or a plurality of resource records, the first database being stored by a domain name server, referred to as a DNS server, and the system comprising a directory server, referred to as an LDAP server, able to be accessed indirectly from a the DNS server [Fig. 2, Col. 8, Lines 29-36; Col. 20, Line 52 - Col. 21, Line 2; the LDAP stores data uniquely identified by a DN where portions of DN specifies the URL of product server; the URL is converted to IP address within URL table using the domain name server], said DNS server and said directory server belonging to said service provider [Col. 20, Line 67 – Col. 21, Line 2; Col. 21, Lines 54-60; Col. 32, Lines 35-41; the LDAP server is operated by the product manufacturer (ISP customer) and the ISP can host this as a shared server; the DNS server is typically assigned by the customer's Internet service provider], the system further comprising:

a communication arrangement for enabling the said system to receive from a telecommunication terminal a request for modification of the said record or a programming of such a request [Fig. 1; Col 4, Lines 30-39; information can be retrieved from multiple communication terminals];

a controller for determining, from said modification request transmitted to the said system or previously programmed in the said system, a domain name and an operation to be performed on the record [Col. 5, Lines 29-35; Col. 8, Lines 29-36; the product code translator accepts cross-references from manufacturers where the product code is associated with a URL and the IP address may be modified on the URL table];

a protocol manager for seeking, from the domain name, the IP address of the server storing the said first database and, according to the operation, for transmitting to the server a request to update the record [Col. 8, Lines 29-36; URL is converted to IP address within URL table using domain name server] by indirection in the LDAP dynamic directory of said LDAP server [Col. 20, Lines 52-55; LDAP directory server to use distinguished names (DN) which may take the form of a company code portion of a universal product code].

8. Regarding Claim 34, Call discloses all the limitations of Claim 33 above. Call further discloses of using an authenticator for authenticating, at the application level, the sender of the request from authentication information stored in a second local or remote database (Col. 6, Lines 20-22, 34-37, and 42-46; registration handler can request email confirmation, password confirmation, or use web certificates stored in a separate database of certificates).

Art Unit: 2153

9. Regarding Claim 35, Call discloses all the limitations of Claim 34 above. Call further discloses of where the protocol manager is arranged to respond to an indication of the sender of the request having been authenticated by transmitting a consultation request according to the DNS protocol to the DNS server, the request having as its argument the domain name, and receiving a first response from the server (Col. 21, Lines 50-52, 60-65; Col. 21 and 22, Lines 66 and 1-3, respectively; cross-referencing IP address using primary DNS server, receiving IP address, then requesting permission to access site).

10. Regarding Claim 36, Call discloses all the limitations of Claim 35 above. Call further discloses of where the controller is arranged to store the first database by the DNS server by extracting from the first response information included in the record and formatting the information in order to transmit the information to said terminal via the communication arrangement (Fig. 6; Col. 21, 50-58; Col. 22, Lines 61-63; information is provided via online through a browser).

11. Regarding Claims 37 – 39, Call discloses all the limitations of Claim 35 above. Call further discloses the use of an LDAP server to store the first database where the controller is arranged to extract the address of the LDAP server from the first response (Col. 20; Lines 60-67; request is sent to remote directory using LDAP protocol to obtain URL), where the protocol manager is arranged to transmit a consultation request according to the LDAP protocol to the LDAP server and to receive a second response from the LDAP server (Col. 20; Lines 60-67; second request mode to fetch information about the product from a second LDAP server at the URL specified by the first server),

Art Unit: 2153

and the controller is arranged to extract from the second response information included in the record and to format it for transmission to the terminal via the communication arrangement (Col. 21; Lines 2-4; Col. 23; Lines 13-15; product information is supplied to the browser via XML data in response to the requests).

12. Regarding Claims 40 – 43, Call discloses all the limitations of Claims 36 and 39 above. Call further discloses that the controller is arranged to respond to an updating operation determined by the controller to instruct the protocol manager to transmit an update request according to the DNS protocol (Col. 5, Lines 29-36; Col. 6, Lines 15-19; product code translator processes incoming registration data to either create or alter data). Additionally, Call discloses that the protocol manager is arranged to receive an updating confirmation/invalidation response from the DNS server and the controller is arranged to format the updating confirmation/invalidation response before ordering transmission of the updating confirmation/invalidation response to the terminal via the communication arrangement (Col. 6, Lines 19-46; validation that the update to the database is from an authorized source can be implemented in many ways before the update is processed, such as email confirmation, web certificates, and password access). Furthermore, the use of LDAP protocol and servers to implement such a system is disclosed by Call (Col. 20, Lines 52-67; the use of LDAP protocol and servers to cross-reference product codes within a database).

13. Regarding Claim 51, Call discloses all the limitations of Claim 33 above. Call further discloses that the protocol manager is arranged to use a DNS protocol of the

Art Unit: 2153

secure type (Col. 6, Lines 42-46; certificates can be used to authenticate requests to the server made via DNS protocol).

14. Regarding Claims 58 – 60, Call discloses all the limitations of Claim 33 above. Call further discloses of the system comprising of an IP interface (Fig. 1; components can communicate through the internet). Call also discloses the use of web pages for an authentication form (Col. 6, Lines 10-12; registration template accepted via HTML web page form) and a form for entering a request for consultation or modification of said record, representing one or more items of information about the record or an updating confirmation/invalidation response in the form of web pages (Col. 6, Lines 10-12; web template also used to modify information in database; Col. 22, Lines 61-63; the use of a browser by an online shopper to view information within database). Additionally, Call discloses that the communication arrangement comprises of an SMTP server for receiving, in the form of e-mails, a request for consultation or modification of the record and for transmitting in the form of e-mails one or more items of information about the record and/or an updating confirmation/invalidation response (Col. 6; Lines 12-13 and 26-31; email can be used to submit registration information and confirmation can be required by responding to a predetermined email sent to the registered email address).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 52 – 57 and 64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Call.

Art Unit: 2153

15. Regarding Claim 52, Call discloses all the limitations of Claim 33 above. Call further discloses that the system is capable of using a telephone to send the collaborate/update requests (Col. 6, Lines 14-15). However, Call does not expressly disclose the use of an STN and/or ISDN interface within the system.

It is well known to those skilled in art at the time of the application was filed that an ISDN interface is an obvious method of telephone communication that allows digital transmission of voice and data through ordinary copper wires. This is an obvious deviation of the common telephone line used to communicate within the system. The use of an ISDN interface simplifies the implementation of the system since there is no need for an analog to digital converter to process the data.

Applicant has failed to seasonably challenge the Examiner's assertions of well known subject matter in the previous Office action(s) pursuant to the requirements set forth under MPEP §2144.03. A "seasonable challenge" is an explicit demand for evidence set forth by Applicant in the next response. Accordingly, the claim limitations the Examiner considered as "well known" in the first Office action, i.e. a voice menu using a voice synthesis module or a voice file reproduction module along with a DTMF signal and/or voice recognition module to provide an automated telephone interface for a user, are now established as admitted prior art of record for the course of the prosecution. See *In re Chevenard*, 139 F.2d 71, 60 USPQ 239 (CCPA 1943).

16. Regarding Claim 53, Call discloses all the limitations of Claim 52 above. However, Call does not expressly disclose the use of a voice synthesis module or a

Art Unit: 2153

voice file reproduction module for generating a voice menu that recognizes DTMF signals and/or voice choices in the voice menu.

It is well known to those skilled in the art at that time the application was filed that a voice synthesis module or a voice file reproduction module can be used for generating a voice menu reproducing one or more items of information on the recorded voice form. It is also well known that a recognition module for DTMF signals and/or a voice recognition module are used to recognize a choice from the voice menu. It would be obvious to use a voice menu to retrieve data through a telephone to allow consultation or modification of the database without the need of a live operator answering these requests.

Applicant has failed to seasonably challenge the Examiner's assertions of well known subject matter in the previous Office action(s) pursuant to the requirements set forth under MPEP §2144.03. A "seasonable challenge" is an explicit demand for evidence set forth by Applicant in the next response. Accordingly, the claim limitations the Examiner considered as "well known" in the first Office action, i.e. a voice menu using a voice synthesis module or a voice file reproduction module along with a DTMF signal and/or voice recognition module to provide an automated telephone interface for a user, are now established as admitted prior art of record for the course of the prosecution. See *In re Chevenard*, 139 F.2d 71, 60 USPQ 239 (CCPA 1943).

17. Regarding Claims 54 and 55, Call discloses all the limitations of Claim 52 above. However, Call does not expressly disclose the use of videotext or SMS messaging to consult or modify the record stored in the database.

It is well known to those skilled in the art at that time the application was filed that videotex can be used for managing a menu to enter a request for consultation or modification of the record and to reproduce one or more items of information about the record or an update confirmation/invalidation response. It is also well known that SMS messages can be used to transmit and receive information. Either would be obvious deviations of the various other methods of consulting or modifying the database disclosed in Call, such as email, website, and telephone.

Applicant has failed to seasonably challenge the Examiner's assertions of well known subject matter in the previous Office action(s) pursuant to the requirements set forth under MPEP §2144.03. A "seasonable challenge" is an explicit demand for evidence set forth by Applicant in the next response. Accordingly, the claim limitations the Examiner considered as "well known" in the first Office action, i.e. the use of videotex and SMS messaging to consult or modify records within a database, are now established as admitted prior art of record for the course of the prosecution. See *In re Chevenard*, 139 F.2d 71, 60 USPQ 239 (CCPA 1943).

18. Regarding Claim 56, Call discloses all the limitations of Claim 52 above. Call further discloses of a communication arrangement comprises a user-to-user information (UUI) sending/receiving module, for receiving, in the form of an item of UUI, a request for consultation or modification of the record and to transmit in the form of an item of UUI, one or more items of information about the record or an updating confirmation/invalidation response (Col. 14, Lines 3-7; the exchange of business documents between computers connected within the system).

Art Unit: 2153

19. Regarding Claim 57, Call discloses all the limitations of Claim 52 above.

However, Call does not expressly disclose the use of a fax module to transmit information.

It is well known to those skilled in the art at the time the application was filed that using a fax module to transmit information between two communication points. Using a fax module is an obvious deviation of using many of the other common communication methods disclosed in Call, such as email, regular mail, and telephone. Allowing the system to communicate through a fax module allows the vendors to use another common method known at the time of the invention.

Applicant has failed to seasonably challenge the Examiner's assertions of well known subject matter in the previous Office action(s) pursuant to the requirements set forth under MPEP §2144.03. A "seasonable challenge" is an explicit demand for evidence set forth by Applicant in the next response. Accordingly, the claim limitations the Examiner considered as "well known" in the first Office action, i.e. the use of a fax module to transmit information, are now established as admitted prior art of record for the course of the prosecution. See *In re Chevenard*, 139 F.2d 71, 60 USPQ 239 (CCPA 1943).

20. Regarding Claim 64, Call discloses all the limitations of Claim 33 above.

However, Call does not expressly disclose that the system stores data of the A, NS, MD, MF, CNAME, SOA, MB, MG, MR, NULL, WKS, PTR, HINFO, MINFO, MX, or TXT type.

It is well known in the art at the time the application was filed that this list of query names (A, NS, MD, MF, CNAME, SOA, MB, MG, MR, NULL, WKS, PTR, HINFO, MINFO, MX, or TXT) are all file types that are used by the DNS lookup tool to convert IP addresses to hostnames and vice versa and to obtain aliases. It is obvious to one skilled in the art that the use of one or many of these query types is an obvious deviation of the process of looking up an IP address via a DNS.

Applicant has failed to seasonably challenge the Examiner's assertions of well known subject matter in the previous Office action(s) pursuant to the requirements set forth under MPEP §2144.03. A "seasonable challenge" is an explicit demand for evidence set forth by Applicant in the next response. Accordingly, the claim limitations the Examiner considered as "well known" in the first Office action, i.e. the use of A, NS, MD, MF, CNAME, SOA, MB, MG, MR, NULL, WKS, PTR, HINFO, MINFO, MX, or TXT as file types within a system containing a DNS, are now established as admitted prior art of record for the course of the prosecution. See *In re Chevenard*, 139 F.2d 71, 60 USPQ 239 (CCPA 1943).

Claims 44 – 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Call as applied to Claim 34 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,862,325, invented by Drummond Shattuck Reed et al. (hereinafter referenced as “Reed”).

21. Regarding Claims 44 – 47, Call discloses all the limitations of Claim 33 as stated above. However, Call does not specifically disclose that the controller is arranged to store in the second database a configuration profile transmitted via the communication

Art Unit: 2153

arrangement, the profile including one or more programmed modification requests, each programmed modification request being associated with at least one time range and/or one geographical area. Nor does Call disclose that the system comprises of a configuration automatic controller for scrutinizing the second database and testing whether a measurement of time belongs to the range and/or a location of the terminal belongs to the area, and, in response to a positive result, extracting the associated programmed modification request and transmitting to the protocol manager a request to consult the first database.

Reed discloses applying rules into the operational functionality of databases that makes them capable of initiating communications and database processing based on time, system variables, system events, or other conditions (Col. 21, Lines 33-39). Reed further discloses that these rules are associated with methods to be executed when these conditions are met, such as backing up the database after X days (Col. 21, Lines 45-61). Furthermore, it is well known in the art at the time the application was filed that having processes conditioned upon a specific event or variable must be stored or programmed into the system to be triggered. It would be obvious to one skilled in the art to apply the use of rules within the system disclosed in Call to effectively process database retrievals or modifications. Certain conditions, such as holiday sales, temperature changes, or interest rate changes, can have an effect on the data that is stored within a database and the ability to have such programmed requests decreases the amount of user interface necessary to change the information stored in the database.

Claims 48 – 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Call, in view of Reed, as applied to Claim 47 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,590,274, invented by Michael J. Skarpelos et al. (hereinafter referenced as “Skarpelos”).

22. Regarding Claims 48 and 49, Call, in view of Reed, discloses all the limitations of Claim 47 as stated above. However, Call does not specifically disclose the storing of each confirmation/invalidation response from the first server into another database as a history file that can be accessed by authorized entities through a report transmitted to those who requested such history.

Skarpelos discloses of a system and technique to record and monitor changes to the database (Col. 1, Lines 25-30). This system and technique is not just used in a fault tolerant system to revert back to a previous setting, but also used to view the history of changes to the database (Col. 1, Lines 25-26). It would be obvious to one skilled in the art to record the changes into the database to trace back to prior modifications if there were any errors in the database. Additionally, the ability to revert back to previous data within the database when there are failures during the updating process is necessary to prevent the loss of important data.

23. Regarding Claim 50, Call, in view of Reed, and in further view of Skarpelos, discloses all the limitations of Claim 49 above. However, Call, in view of Reed and Skarpelos, does not expressly disclose that a history report of the database will be sent to a notification terminal.

It would be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the application to use the email confirmation process disclosed in Call to transmit the history data of the database at the request of a user. The system in Call encompasses all the required components necessary to store history data in another database, authenticate where the request is coming from, and to send a report to the requestor. Again, the ability to revert back to previous data within the database when there are failures during the updating process is necessary to prevent the loss of important data.

Claims 61 – 63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Call as applied to Claim 33 above, and further in view of the non-patent literature titled “E.164 number and DNS” by P. Faltstrom (hereinafter referenced as “Faltstrom”).

24. Regarding Claims 61 – 63, Call discloses all the limitations of Claim 33 as stated above. However, Call does not specifically disclose that the controller is arranged to determine a domain name from a subscriber identifier, whether or not the E.164 telephone number is used. Further, Call does not disclose that the controller is arranged to extract information and to determine according to the request an operation to be performed on a resource record of the Naming Authority Pointer (NAPTR).

Faltstrom discloses of the use of using the DNS for storage of E.164 numbers and how the DNS is used for identification of the available services associated with those numbers (Abstract; Pg. 1-2, Ch. 2). Additionally, NAPTR resource records are used to convert E.164 telephone numbers to Uniform Resource Identifier to identify the associated services (Pgs. 3-4, Ch. 3). It is also well know in the art at the time the

Art Unit: 2153

application was filed that E.164 numbers was recommended as the international public telecommunication numbering plan for ISDN lines. It would be obvious to one skilled in the art that the use E.164 telephone numbers is recommended to conform to the international standards that were established.

Conclusion

Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular figures, columns, line numbers, and/or paragraphs in the references applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art disclosed by the Examiner.

In the case of amending the claimed invention, Applicant is respectfully requested to indicate the portion(s) of the specification which dictate(s) the structure relied on for proper interpretation and also to verify and ascertain the metes and bounds of the claimed invention.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. U.S. Appl. 2001/0049745 - method of forwarding communications using an address which is known or believed to be invalid; U.S. Patent 6,009,103 - method and system for adding new user configuration parameters.

Contacts

Art Unit: 2153

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tae K. Kim, whose telephone number is (571) 270-1979. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (8:00 AM - 5:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton B. Burgess, can be reached on (571) 272-3949. The fax phone number for submitting all Official communications is (703) 872-9306. The fax phone number for submitting informal communications such as drafts, proposed amendments, etc., may be faxed directly to the examiner at (571) 270-2979.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at (866) 217-9197 (toll-free).

/Tae K. Kim/

/Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2152